



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,954	10/08/2003	Ralph F. Kalies	036806.00431	7906
7590 07/06/2010				
Louis C. Dujmich Ostrolenk, Faber, Gerb & Soffen, LLP 1180 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036-8403				
EXAMINER				
REYES, REGINALD R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/06/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/681,954

**Applicant(s)**

KALIES, RALPH F.

**Examiner**

REGINALD REYES

**Art Unit**

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 15-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. This office action is made Final. Claims 1-9 and 15-16, have been examined and are addressed below.

### ***Response to Amendments/Arguments***

2. The rejection of claim 1-9 and 15-16 under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment of the claim.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-10 and 15-16 have been considered but are not persuasive. With respect to claim 1 applicant argues that the prior art does not teach first and second access security. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As Schoenberg shows in fig. 2 and column 4 lines 52-67, it shows a flow diagram of the method of distributing medical information. There is a first level access security is taught on element 216 of Fig. 2 where the received info is determined if it's a unique patient match. Element 220 is the second level access security where it determines if the codes satisfy the identification constraints. Since Mehring teaches a method step of sorting data into restricted and unrestricted data where the data is sorted into multiple levels (access security third and forth) of restricted data, with each requiring another security level to access (see for example Mehring column 14 lines 64-67 and column 15 lines 1-16). It would be an obvious combination/modification of the prior arts to distribute medical information in which the medical care provider or

pharmacy has quick access to a patient's medical record, but only to the information within the medical record that is needed by the user (medical professional, doctor, nurse) for the proper treatment of the patient at the time.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-9, 15-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donoho et al (U.S. 7,346,655) in view of Schoenberg (U.S. 6,463,417) and Mehring et al (U.S. 6,609,115).
5. With respect to claim 1, Donoho teaches a method for storing and reporting pharmacy data, comprising the steps of: generating by a plurality of pharmacies (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 4-6 and column 92 lines 25-39), each of the pharmacies operating within a managed care organization, electronic pharmacy data comprising medical, financial and transactional information related to pharmaceutical transactions (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 4-6 and column 92 lines 25-39). Donoho teaches providing the report to the requestor (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 5-6 and column 53 lines 17-20). Donoho teaches receiving over a network, by

a processing center of the managed care organization, a data transfer request to transfer respective electronic pharmacy data from at least one of the plurality of pharmacies (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 4-6 and column 92 lines 25-39).

Donoho does not teach providing first access security by the processing center in response to the data transfer request, wherein the first access security includes checking credentials defined by the processing center and submitted for authorization by the at least one pharmacy; providing second access security by the processing center in case the at least one pharmacy passes the first access security, wherein the second access security includes, prior to accepting the respective electronic pharmacy data by the processing center, checking whether the respective electronic pharmacy data meet at least one predefined validity requirement defined by the processing center; receiving, by the processing center, a transfer of the respective electronic pharmacy data pursuant to compliance with the second access security ; processing, organizing and structuring the electronic pharmacy data by the processing center to format the electronic pharmacy data in accordance with at least one of a predetermined protocol and format; storing the processed electronic pharmacy data in a data warehouse; storing subsets of the processed electronic pharmacy data in a data mart, the subsets being adapted to meet specific demands of particular requestors in terms of analysis, content, presentation and format, by storing a portion of a larger set of data residing in the data warehouse thereby to allow preparation of predetermined sets of reports pertinent to the particular requestors; receiving by the processing center a data request from a data requestor to obtain at least a portion of the processed electronic pharmacy

data, the data requestor having a privilege level identifying the type of data available to the requestor; providing third access security by the processing center in response to the data request, wherein the third access security includes checking credentials defined by the processing center and submitted for authorization by the data requestor; providing fourth access security by the processing center in case the data requestor passes the third access security, wherein the fourth access security includes checking whether requested electronic pharmacy data is consistent with the scope of the privilege level of the data requestor; formatting the portion of the electronic pharmacy data requested by the data requestor into a report pursuant to compliance with the fourth access security, the portion of the electronic pharmacy data for the report being developed from the data in the data warehouse or the subsets of the data in the data mart.

Schoenberg teaches storing at a datastore/data warehouse the health data and associated access priority data and receiving from a requester (see for example Schoenberg column 2 lines 40-62). Schoenberg teaches further a schematic diagram of a patient's medical record in accordance to the security access codes generated by the patient (formatting data). The security access codes that are easily ascertained are assigned to low security categories and security access codes that are more difficult to ascertain are assigned that high security categories (see for example Schoenberg column 2 lines 40-62 and column 6 lines 26-64 and Fig. 3). With respect to the "subsets being adapted to . . . ." it is obvious to substitute one type of data with another as long as the method is performed.

Mehring teaches a method step of sorting data into restricted and unrestricted data where the data is sorted into multiple levels of restricted data, with each requiring another security level to access (see for example Mehring column 14 lines 64-67 and column 15 lines 1-16). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found it obvious to combine the method of storing and reporting pharmacy data as taught by Donoho with the secured data access taught by Schoenberg with the multiple levels of restricted data as taught by Mehring with the motivation to distribute medical information in which the medical care provider or pharmacy has quick access to a patient's medical record, but only to the information within the medical record that is needed by the user (medical professional, doctor, nurse) for the proper treatment of the patient at the time.

6. Referring to Claim 2, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of: encrypting by the respective plurality of pharmacies the pharmacy data before transferring the electronic pharmacy data to the processing center (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 55-58); decrypting the electronic pharmacy data by the processing center after obtaining it the electronic pharmacy data is received (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 61-62).

7. Referring to Claim 3, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the electronic pharmacy data are obtained by means of

received via an electronic communications network (see for example Donoho column 57 lines 46-47).

8. Referring to Claim 4, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 3 wherein the requestor requests and receives the report by means of an electronic communications network (see for example Donoho column 14 lines 15-21 and Fig. 21).

9. Referring to Claim 5, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 4 wherein the electronic communications network is an intranet (see for example Donoho column 8 lines 2-9).

10. Referring to Claim 6, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 4 wherein the electronic communications network is the internet (see for example Donoho column 8 lines 2-9).

11. Referring to Claim 7, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the requestor is selectively allowed access to a greater or lesser portion of the electronic pharmacy data based upon predetermined criteria (see for example Donoho column 18 lines 23-39).



12. Referring to Claim 8, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of checking by the processing center the electronic pharmacy data for defects before storing it (see for example Donoho column 42 lines 27-35).

13. Referring to Claim 9, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of encrypting the report by the processing center before sending it to the requestor (see for example Donoho column 19 lines 66-67 and column 20 lines 1-6).

14. Referring to Claim 15, Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the report represents financial performance by an individual pharmacy, financial performance by a plurality of pharmacies, or a medication review (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 5-6 and column 53 lines 17-20).

15. Referring to Claim 16 Donoho in view of Schoenberg and Mehring teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the processing center formats the electronic pharmacy data or the report to comply with HIPAA (see for example Donoho column 53 lines 5-6 and column 53 lines 17-20).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 7,401,027 teaches methods for collecting fees for healthcare management group.

U.S. Patent No. 7,398,217 teaches methods and systems for healthcare practice management.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REGINALD REYES whose telephone number is (571)270-5212. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry O'Connor can be reached on 571-272-6787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,954  
Art Unit: 3626

Page 10

/R. R./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3626

/C. Luke Gilligan/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626